DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 892 CE 046 016

AUTHOR Smith, Charles W.; And Others
TITLE Implications of the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Commission Reports for Vocational Teacher Education. Symposium on Critical Issues in Vocational Teacher Education and Strategies for Improvement.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Vocational Association (Dallas, TX, December 1986).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Attitudes; Education Courses; Education Majors; Methods Courses; Postsecondary Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Improvement; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Educators; Teacher Qualifications; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Nation Prepared (A); *Tomorrows Teachers

ABSTRACT

This document contains four papers presented at a panel on implications of the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Commission reports for vocational teacher education. In the first paper, Charles W. Smith discusses general issues concerning the emergence of the education reform movement and calls for vocational educators to be part of the reform discussions. In the second paper, Ruth P. Hughes reviews "Tomorrow's Teachers," the recommendations of the Holmes Group of college deans of education. She concludes that although vocational educators cannot accept without modification some suggested changes (such as a six-year program), there are other suggestions with which vocational teacher educators can work for improvement within all teacher education. The third paper, by Curtis R. Finch, has two purposes. First, it is designed to summarize and synthesize the contents of the Carnegie report, "A Nation Prepared," giving particular attention to eight major recommendations for change in education policy. Secondly, it discusses how the Carnegie report may have an impact on vocational teacher education. The final paper, by Jasper S. Lee, focuses on trends and anticipated actions in coping with the two (Holmes and Carnegie) teacher education models that have been proposed. Each of the papers contains a bibliography. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276892

Symposium on Critical Issues in Vocational Teacher Education
and Strategies for Improvement
1986 National Convention
Dallas, Texas

Implications of the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Commission Reports for Vocational Teacher Education

Presenters

Dr. Charles W. Smith
Dean, College of Education
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. Ruth P. Hughes
Distinguished Professor in Home Economics
Head, Home Economics Education
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Dr. Curtis R. Finch
Professor and Coordinator
International Studies in Education
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
Virginia Tech University
Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. Jasper S. Lee
Professor and Head
Department of Agricultural and Extension Education
Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, Mississippi

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C W Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE046016

Emergence of the Education Reform Movement

Charles W. Smith

Louisiana State University

The decade of the 1980's will likely be viewed by historians as a period during which educational reform was at the center of the country's agenda. In the last several years we have seen one of the greatest upheavals in public education in modern times. The quality of our public education system has been challenged from our kindergartens through our universities. The critics suggest that a failure of the education community to respond to these concerns could ultimately lead to the dismantling of public education as we know it today.

Public opinion suggests that our schools do not measure up to the nation's expectations and it is becoming increasingly clear that policy makers do not believe there is enough good teaching in the classrooms of America's schools. There is a sense of urgency that something must be done immediately to prevent further erosion of public confidence and to upgrade the quality of education at all levels.

A litany of commission reports, books, periodicals, and national meetings has concluded that the education of youth and adults must be reformed. Accompanying this upheaval have been legislative proposals in almost all states directed at ensuring that America's schools do, in fact, reform themselves.

The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), A Nation at Risk: Imperatives for Educational Reform, stated that:

> America's position in the world may once have been reasonably secure with only a few exceptionally well-trained men and women. It is no longer. The people of the United States need to know that individuals in our society who do not possess the level of skill, literacy, and training essential to this new era will be effectively disenfranchised, not simply for the material rewards that accompany competent performance but also for the chance to participate fully in our national life.

Since the commission report was issued in 1983, the media has focused extensively on our nation's schools and has done much to galvanize the public's perceptions. A major realization is the fact that we live on a planet with a world-wide economy and we compete with well-educated and strongly motivated competitors. If we are to insure that a growing number of individuals have access to upward economic and social mobility, improved education must be viewed as the essential ingredient for both.

In this decade education is one of America's most treasured commodities. The have nots view themselves as having been educationally underserved and see education as the means to economic and social mobility. Those who have prospered in our free enterprise system are now feeling threatened by the fact that their own children may not attain a standard of living equivalent to their own, much less to surpass it.

Over the last decade we have seen a deep erosion of confidence in our schools coupled with disturbing evidence that at least some of the skepticism was justified. Major concerns revolve around these issues:

1. American students score lower on certain tests than do students from other industrialized countries.

2. Some 20 million adults are functionally illiterate and for minorities it is more than twice that of the majority race.

3. Achievement test scores of high school students are now lower than when the space race began over 25 years ago.

4. The critical thinking skills of students have been diminished as evidenced by certain indicators.

5. Remedial education is common place on most college campuses.

As a result, we have seen a flood of state legislation affecting education in the last several years. Much of this legislation has implications for vocational teacher education, and has focused on one or more of the following areas:

1. Teacher testing
2. Career ladders and merit pay
3. Master teacher programs
4. Teacher internship programs
5. Teacher certification and recertification
6. Teacher performance assessment
7. Alternative certification programs
8. Extended teacher education programs

The perceived threat of a public school system that is approaching bankruptcy has moved legislators to find quick fixes to turn this tide of mediocrity. Not unexpectantly, the focus has been to fix the schools and teachers alike.

Teacher education, for the most part, has never been held in high esteem by our colleagues from other departments on our campuses or by the general public. More recently, our own graduates have become our severest critics, usually after having a less than desirable teaching experience. Is it any wonder that we are viewed with disdain by policy makers?

Public perception and reality are not always congruent. In the case of teacher education, there has been little opportunity for us to convince the general public that there is a growing knowledge base in which we engage our students that informs good teaching. In too many instances teacher education has been viewed as the problem rather than a part of the solution.

Our critics typically attack us by stating that:

1. Teacher education majors pursue a less demanding curriculum than do arts and science majors.

2. Teacher education curricula are heavily weighted with courses in "educational methods" at the expense of courses in subjects to be taught.

3. Colleges, Schools, and Departments of Teacher Education offer too many redundant education courses that lack rigor and do not challenge students.

In general, teacher education suffers from the illusion that great things can be obtained with minor investments of time and resources. Many believe that if there are problems with the quality of instruction in our schools then surely the problems have their origins in the teacher training programs of our colleges and universities.

In a recent address to the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Governor Lamar Alexander of Tennessee stated that teacher education programs and teacher certification will receive high priority among governors in the second wave of reform legislation. This comes at a time when most teacher training program enrollments are down some 40 percent nationwide. It also comes at a time when students entering teacher education programs are viewed to be of less than desirable quality when compared to other college majors.

Both the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association have called for tougher standards for the preparation of teachers and some professional organizations are questioning the fact that we have too many small teacher education programs. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education in its redesign of its accreditation standards, in effect, raises admission standards into teacher education, calls for a significant change in the program content, and

emphasizes an increased reliance on the knowledge base for teacher education (Teacher Education Reports, September 11, 1986).

In a recent study by the American Association of College of Teacher Education (1986), it was reported that half of the states now require testing at some point prior to certification, and two-thirds of the states have mandated increased standards for schools, colleges, and departments of education.

More recently the report of the National Governors' Association (1986), Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, calls for a major restructuring of the nation's schools and challenges higher education to redesign teacher education.

Two highly publicized reports have focused directly on the preparation of teachers and will, in all likelihood, dramatically influence how teachers are prepared in the future.

A Report of the Holmes Group: Tomorrow's Teachers (1986), the first of the reports, has generated national attention with its goals for restructuring teacher education. Over a period of two years, a small group of deans of education met to discuss how they might work together to restructure teacher education on their respective campuses. These discussions led them to three major conclusions. First, redesign of teacher education could not be accomplished within the framework of a bachelor's degree. Second, the conditions under which teachers work would have to be significantly altered if major improvements in the quality of

schools were to be accomplished. Third, it would be necessary to work toward differentiated staffing of classrooms by recognizing the differences in level of professional preparation. The Holmes Group recommendations suggest a model that they perceive will professionalize teaching as a career and have invited the major research universities to join them in working toward implementation of their plan.

The second report, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, the report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986), reinforces many of the recommendations of the Holmes Group.

More explicitly, major recommendations include: (1) the establishment of a national board for professional teaching standards; (2) the abolishment of undergraduate degrees in education and making teacher education a graduate level function; (3) basing continuing education of teachers on acquiring and/or maintaining national board certification; and (4) improving the professional environment for teachers based on incentive, performance, and productivity. The Carnegie Report also speaks to the issue of professionalizing teaching as a career.

Both reports taken together are quite powerful in that they provide us with a penetrating analysis of what some believe must be done if improvements are to be made in the preparation of teachers. The issues raised will undoubtedly be debated by educators and policy makers for some time to come. The reform discussion could provide teacher educators with a real window of opportunity to significantly restructure teacher education.

Neither the Holmes Group Report nor the Carnegie Commission Report make mention of vocational education, yet implications are there. Forces that influence one area of teacher education will influence the other. It is important that vocational educators at all levels have an understanding of the critical issues raised in these reports. As a group, vocational educators have considerable knowledge and expertise that can be brought to bear in ultimately determining future direction in the preparation of teachers.

The consequences of vocational educators failing to enter into the teacher education reform discussions could be serious. To either ignore the issues or reject them outright is to abrogate our professional responsibility. What has been accomplished in vocational education over the course of the last seventy-five years has not occurred without considerable challenge. To move the profession forward, the AVA membership must be informed of the issues and involved in charting future directions in teacher training.

Bibliography

A Nation at Risk: The Imperatives for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, April, 1983.

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986.

A Report of the Holmes Group: Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Michigan: The Holmes Group, Inc., 1986.

Teacher Education Policy in the States: 50 State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1986.

Teacher Education Reports. New York. Washington, D.C.: Volume 8, Number 17, September, 1986.

Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1986.

The Holmes Group: Tomorrow's Teachers
Implications for Vocational Teacher Education

Ruth P. Hughes

Iowa State University

The recent concern for quality of education in the United States began in the early 80s with various commission and task force reports on secondary education. Most of them, including the well-known Nation at Risk, either neglected vocational education or failed to note its contributions. Now another group of task forces has extended the concern to teacher education and again, they do not include vocational teacher education.

The purpose of this report is to review one of the first of those reports, Tomorrow's Teachers, the recommendations of the Holmes Group, a consortium composed of deans of education from research-oriented institutions with teacher education programs. The original group of 17 deans, expanded once, is now in the process of a further expansion that will cover all areas of the country.

The review of the 1986 report is in two parts: comments of a general nature and, secondly, specific comments on each of the five major goals of the group.

The general impressions include noting the failure to designate vocational areas although neither the fine arts nor the performing arts nor physical education were included. We could assume that the only concern

was academic subjects-- with grudging attention to elementary--or we could assume that the group did not regard us as different and intended that we be included all along. The latter explanation is preferable, because it places us in the main stream.

Another general comment is a question as to whether the ideas are new, in spite of protests to the contrary. For example, the addition of a year or two of education to a baccalaureate degree was the basis of the Master of Arts in Teaching, popular in the late 50s and 60s and still available. The idea is not necessarily a poor one, but it is not new.

Other ideas identified as "new" in teacher education are not new to us but may be new in the academic areas. The Holmes Group suggests that public school personnel be members of university faculties, involved in teaching prospective teachers on campus as well as supervising their work in the school itself. Such a plan was in effect prior to the 1960s, discontinued then in vocational programs because there were so many student teachers that the logistics were not manageable.

Professional Development Schools are proposed as new. Although the group disavows the likeness of professional development schools to the familiar "laboratory school," the differences are not that great, especially considering the better laboratory schools. Some deliberately enrolled not only the more academically able (as charged by the Holmes Group), but also the less academically able students.

The five major goals of the Holmes Group deserve our careful attention. Even if the propositions are not necessarily new, it is appropriate to consider variations of tomorrow's teacher education programs. The report includes not only the goals but plans for implementation (p. 4, pp. 61-68). Both will be included in the discussion that follows.

1. To make the education of teachers intellectually more solid.

The proposal for expertise in subject matter is an expectation in vocational education. We expect our teachers to have degrees in business, agriculture, home economics, or industrial technology, and we incorporate pedagogy during the years of study for the baccalaureate. To move from four to six or even five years without research support for the change is too large a leap, especially given economic conditions in many states. We prefer that prospective teachers have experiences in teaching all through their undergraduate years and that a five or more year programs be options.

If we have a problem in vocational teacher education, it is in areas where teachers do not have a baccalaureate. However, these non-degreed teachers are expert in their subject area; they lack general education and pedagogy. We support the recommendation of the National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education: That teachers should have degrees or, if not, be in some form of differentiated staffing. Perhaps the Holmes Report will provide impetus for a change.

2. To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work.

Provision for a career ladder for teachers is consistent with recommendations already made in several states. Whether three levels is the appropriate number is debatable but the recommendation has merit. In fact, a ladder could provide for a separate level for teachers without a degree.

3. To create standards of entry to the profession--examinations and educational requirements--that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible.

It is difficult to say anything about teachers of vocational subjects that do not apply to all teachers. The examinations recommended by the Holmes Group are prior to admission to teacher education and prior to the clinical experience. Many of us would support such tests; in fact, we may already have them.

We should support also their special concern for minority teachers. We have a fine opportunity under the equity provisions of the Perkins Act to give the financial support that will entice minority students into teaching. Our responsibility is to make the effort to see that funds are used for this more often than is now the case. We can seek funds not only from the Perkins Act but from other funding designed to increase minority representation in teaching.

4. To connect our own institutions to schools.

The Holmes Group proposes this as a new idea, and it was included in general comments. We can be leaders here because we already have extensive involvement with teachers in public schools, probably more than many teacher educators in academic subjects. We can increase our involvement with schools in both teaching and research. Such programs are expensive but perhaps today's technology can provide opportunity for frequent interchange at lower cost in time as well as dollars.

5. To make schools better places for teachers to work, and to learn.

Within the last few months, we contacted some of our recent graduates who left teaching. Some left because the administration was impossible. In fact, some were prohibited from participation on any state committees or inservice activities on a school day. In other instances, the administration was supportive but the young teachers felt that they were regarded poorly in the community, even though they were expected to perform in an exemplary manner.

Improvement of the workplace is another instance in which the Holmes Report is on target. The recommendation may have greater impact on the education of administrators and boards of education than on teachers, but there are administrators in vocational education. Perhaps we can nudge them and nudge our colleagues who prepare principals and administrators to "make the professional education of administrators compatible with the

requirements of the profession of teaching" (p. 68).[1]

Summary

As with any proposal for change, there are in the Holmes Group report some suggested changes that we cannot accept without modification--a six year program, for example. But there are other suggestions with which vocational teacher education can work for improvement within all teacher education. As vocational teacher educators, we have some unique problems but we also have contributions to the total field of teacher education.

[1]The Holmes Group, Tomorrow's Teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing: MI, 1986.

The Carnegie Commission Report: Implications For Vocational Teacher Education

Curtis R. Finch
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Following closely in the wake of numerous commission and task force studies related to secondary education are two reports that deal directly with teacher education. This paper focuses on one such report which is aptly title A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. More commonly known as the "Carnegie Report", it was developed by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Such an effort indeed represents a great deal of time put forth by outstanding professionals over a twelve month plus period. The report must certainly not be taken lightly; proposed changes to educational policy are far reaching and will certainly promote lively debate among persons within and outside the education profession.

The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, it is designed to summarize and synthesize the Carnegie Report's contents giving particular attention to eight major recommendations for change in education policy. Secondly, and perhaps more important is a discussion of how the Carnegie Report may impact on vocational teacher education. Since the Task Force chose to examine the teacher preparation process from a liberal arts and sciences base, it is of particular import to study the Task Force recommendations from a vocational teacher education perspective. As a conclusion to the paper, several questions are raised about teacher preparation in general and vocational teacher preparation in particular.

These questions should serve as catalysts for further discussion about the Carnegie Report and how it may or may not align with current and future thought about vocational teaching.

What Does The Report Tell Us?

Since the Carnegie Report was released, several excellent articles have been prepared that provide excellent descriptions of the Task Force's findings (e.g. Keppel, 1986; Tucker & Mandell, 1986). In addition to these articles, many conclusions reached by the Task Force were similar to those presented by the Holmes Group. In the present context, it thus appears best to provide a brief but perhaps redundant summary of the Carnegie Report's contents.

Essentially, the Task Force members felt that a recent educational renaissance is beginning to improve the quality of our schools. However, in order to effect this change we need a teaching profession that is "equal to the task - a profession of well-educated teachers prepared to assume new powers and responsibilities to redesign schools for the future (Task Force, 1986, p. 2)." As a means of changing the profession, the Task Force recommends significant changes that include:

1. Creating a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, organized with a regional and state membership structure, to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet those standards.

2. Restructuring schools to provide a professional environment for teaching, freeing them to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for student progress.

3. Restructuring the teaching force, and introducing a new category of Lead Teachers with the proven ability to provide active leadership in the design of the schools and in helping their colleagues to uphold high standards of teaching and learning.

4. Require a bachelors degree in the arts and sciences as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching.

5. Develop a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education leading to a Master of Teaching degree, based on systematic knowledge of teaching and including internships and residencies in the schools.

6. Mobilize the nation's resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers.

7. Relate incentives for teachers to school-wide performance, and provide schools with the technology, services and staff essential to teacher productivity.

8. Make teachers' salaries and career opportunities competitive with those in other professions.

One must keep in mind that the above reforms are proposed collectively; they are not meant to be introduced in isolation. Thus, very much like variables in the regression model, the removal of one reform from the equation may produce a result which is far different from what the Task Force envisions.

What Impact May The Report Have?

Before discussing specifics of the Report, it is perhaps best to focus on basic philosophy and context. A fundamental question that seems to emerge from the report is "why was vocational teacher education ignored?" Is it safe to assume that many of the Carnegie Task Force members do not believe in vocational education at the secondary level? This would be consistant with the feelings of other commissions and task forces that have examined education over the past few years. Vocational educators must, therefore, consider that building a case against Task Force recommendations may be a moot point. A large number of influential professionals do not seem to support the current secondary education role of vocational education and, therefore, the role of secondary vocational teachers.

Of equal concern is the context within which vocational teacher preparation takes place. Even through the years when there was an oversupply of teachers, numerous school districts were having great difficulty finding qualified teachers. This demand, coupled with vocational teachers' marketability in business and industry, has made it extremely difficult for administrators to fill vocational teacher positions. If predicted increases in teacher demand also include greater

need for vocational education teachers, the result may be disasterous under current as well as future teacher education arrangements.

Since examining the report on a line by line or page by page basis seems counterproductive, it may be meaningful to focus on several areas that the Task Force appears to have written about. One such area is teacher preparation and degree work. The report presents a case for discarding the undergraduate teaching major in favor of a bachelors degree in arts and sciences coupled with a Master of Teaching degree. This notion is not a new one, having proven to be a quite successful venture for several private liberal arts institutions over the past twenty years. However, examples related to vocational teacher preparation are not available. Perhaps most closely aligned with the arts and sciences undergraduate degree notion would be a horticulture or fashion design major who decides to become certified as a teacher. In these cases, courses and experiences would be taken that provide a transition from a narrowly focused major to what is necessary to teach high school students. The "given" in this situation is that most teachers are required to be generalists in the public schools and, therefore, must take some breadth as well as depth in the content area. A different situation exists with areas that do not have a "arts and sciences" base. Are trade and industrial teachers who have a rather steep requirement for proven occupational experience to be left out in the cold? Technology education/industrial arts teachers may, likewise, be omitted due to lack of a specific "arts and sciences" focus. And what will become of marketing education coordinators who typically take a range of marketing and marketing education courses together with supervised occupational experience? These are but a few of

the questions that may be raised. Vocational teacher educators may find themselves in a sort of Catch-22. If the Task Force recommendations are implemented, the quality of teacher preparation will suffer. If, however, vocational teacher preparation is given special dispensation in relation to other areas of teacher preparation, vocational teachers will most likely be considered as second class citizens with second rate credentials. Setting a common standard for all teachers to meet is fine in theory but creates numerous problems in terms of implementation.

A second area that the report seems to focus on is certification standards. The Task Force noted that its first action would be to establish a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. This Board will set standards for teaching competence, "assess the qualifications of those seeking board certification, and grant certificates to those who meet the standards (Task Force, 1986, p. 62)." The first question that comes to mind is what will the Board specify as competence? Will it entail teacher behavior as associated with student achievement? Anything less than this will be termed unsatisfactory by some persons, however, research on teacher effectiveness is seriously lacking. Although we have a reasonably firm grasp of what teachers do, it is impossible to link this behavior in a predictive fashion. Since vocational education outcomes are often associated with former student success in the work world, the relationship back to teacher behavior becomes even more difficult to assess. Should a National Board become a reality, one of its first agenda items must be to define which elements of competence can and cannot be assessed using our current knowledge and technology base.

Of equal concern is the prospect of interim certification. Although the Task Force report did not expound on possibilities for teachers to be certified on a interim basis, a more recent statement by a Task Force member presents this as a distinct possibility. If such an option were indeed made available, it would enable teachers who are less than board certified to be a part of the teaching profession. This is of particular importance to vocational teacher education because of the different ways that persons choose to enter the teaching profession.

What Questions Remain Unanswered?

There are certainly many other areas presented in the Carnegie Report that might be discussed. Staffing, costs, and the recruitment of minorities into the profession are certainly of prime importance. However, in order to leave something for my colleagues to discuss, it was felt best to merely raise several questions about the impact that the Report recommendations have for vocational teacher education. These questions are not presented in any sort of priority. They merely represent what we need to consider and answer as we plan for the future.

1. Should a vocational teacher hold the Master's degree and demonstrate the highest level of success in the teaching field before he or she is fully certified? The Carnegie Report raises an important question abo teaching standards. While the Task Force recommendations imply that teachers with lesser credentials may teach in a category which is less than "master teacher", this whole area is not very clear. It might well be that the Master's degree will eventually become the minimum educational level

for beginning teachers. If so, how will this affect the ebb and flow of teachers?

2. If the above is true, how can non-degreed teachers be provided with reasonable routes to achieving full certification? Perhaps a system can be created that encourages and rewards progress toward full certification. If non-degreed teachers are to make progress in this area, non-traditional opportunities must be made available for them to complete degrees. One example is the Regents degree system currently functioning in West Virginia and several other states. Likewise, newly hired non-degreed teachers must be apprised of their obligations to complete undergraduate and graduate studies by a certain specified date.

3. Should beginning vocational teachers be provided with close supervision and assistance in the further development of teaching competence? If initiated, such a program would most likely be of a formal nature and include diagnostic and prescriptive activities tailored to the individual teacher's needs. The cost of a program with this focus will obviously be very expensive, more expensive than can be afforded without additional funding.

4. Should vocational teacher preparation be restricted to a single delivery model? The Commission Report emphasizes one best way to prepare teachers. Unfortunately, aspiring vocational teachers do not always come directly from high school like most teachers do. They move into teaching from a variety of settings such as business, industry, and the military. It seems, therefore, that individual qualifications and needs may vary.

Perhaps it is best to allow flexibility of process in teacher education but insist on each person meeting specific standards of subject matter knowledge and teaching quality.

Epilogue

As with others attending the Kansas conference, Lisa was ecstatic. They had arrived expecting to spend all their time fighting over differing perceptions of what the future teacher education curriculum should be like. As it turned out, the fighting was no more than professional level debate and discussion conducted, for the most part, in small group settings. Everyone had worked very hard, even late into the night; but the result was well worth the effort.

Many recommendations were developed for the improvement of teacher education. Some of the more significant ones Lisa heard at the end of the conference were most impressive. "The need for a fifth year of collegiate preparation of teachers was often mentioned. There was wide agreement that four years allowed insufficient time to provide adequate general preparation and the professional sequence. There was general agreement that a substantial portion of the four year program should be devoted to general education -- the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences, including mathematics. Nearly all groups thought that teachers should have a substantial degree of academic specialization in addition to general and specialized education. The notion seemed to be that all teachers should have a respectable major (Hoddenfield & Stinnett, 1961)." Lisa turned to the person next to her who was also preparing to travel back

home after the conference. "How long do you feel it will be until our recommendations are implemented?" said Lisa. "Lisa, I can't be sure, but five years doesn't seem unreasonable. I guess I would say ten years at the most but that is quite a long time: after all, ten years from now would be 1969!"

References

Hoddenfield, G.K. & Stinnett, T.M. (1961). The Education of Teachers. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Keppel, F. (1986). A field guide to the land of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan. 68 (1), 18-23.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Tucker, M. & Mandel, D. (1986). The Carnegie report -- a call for redesigning the schools. Phi Delta Kappan. 68 (1), 24-27.

Training Professional Vocational Education Teachers: Holmes/Carnegie Models

Jasper S. Lee
Mississippi State University

The delivery of quality vocational education in the various local school settings is a function of the competence and effort expended by vocational teachers. The preparation needed by these teachers is particularly critical because of the technology requirements in addition to general and professional education. Providing the preparation is the charge faced by vocational teacher educators. An adequate supply of qualified teachers must be available.

The Holmes and Carnegie models provide particular challenges for vocational teacher educators. (A third widely discussed model is NCATE Redesign. The reforms in this model are extensive yet they are less controversial and more widely endorsed than Holmes and Carnegie (Sikula 1986)). The preparation needed by vocational teachers is more rigorous than that of most other teachers. How well can vocational teacher education accommodate the Holmes and Carnegie models? Is it possible to adapt teacher education to these models and still provide quality vocational teachers? This paper will focus on trends and anticipated actions in coping with the two (Holmes and Carnegie) models.

Trends and Fears

In the preparation of this paper, teacher educators in several

universities were interviewed by telephone to determine what was occurring with respect to the Holmes and Carnegie models. When considering the Holmes model, universities can be placed in four categories: those adopting it, those that are undecided, those rejecting it, and those not invited to join the Holmes Group. The concerns and approaches likely to be taken among those interviewed varied considerably. There are many unknowns--and these are often manifested as fears.

Some teacher educators are working to have vocational teacher education exempted from the provisions if adopted for other areas of teacher education at a university. This was most often mentioned when vocational teacher education is administered outside the department or college of education. This approach concerns me because of the need for vocational teacher education to subscribe to the standards of professionalism followed in teacher education. Such action will likely result in a negative image for vocational teacher education in the university setting. Funding may be impacted as well as accreditation when standards in teacher education governance are considered. In some universities, vocational teacher education is not held in the same high esteem as other curricula. For vocational teacher education to not be included would possibly lead to further deterioration of image among top university officials of the level of scholarship of faculty and students in the university environment.

In addition to the comprehensive general education that is expected for all teachers--and promoted by the Holmes and Carnegie models, vocational teachers must be proficient in an occupational area. For

example, business and office teachers must know about office occupations and auto mechanics teachers must know about automobiles. The technology in most of the occupational areas is continually changing, and the teachers must try to keep up to date. Contrast this to the history or English teacher where the subject being taught changes little unless new events worthy of including in a history class occur or new literature is written. A perplexing concern among vocational teacher educators is how to address the matter of occupational competency in the implementation of either of these models.

Fears also included the ability of vocational teacher education programs to attract students to prepare to become teachers. The problems associated with this fear included a decline in student numbers so that faculty positions could not be justified and the increased use of non-professional "industry" teachers. Also associated with this is the emergence of new institutions in the training of teachers. Since the Holmes model is being embraced most often by the larger, more prestigious universities, the smaller colleges and private institutions may likely expand offerings and become more attractive to students who want to be teachers. In the South, little discussion has occurred relative to the impact of the Holmes and Carnegie models on the traditionally Black institutions, particularly the 1890 land-grant universities. In some states, these institutions would likely expand their mission in vocational teacher education, while in others there would be little impact. Another trend may be the emergence of junior colleges in the retraining of industry-experienced persons to teach vocational courses.

The Holmes and Carnegie models lengthen the time required for teacher credentialing in most institutions. A few vocational teacher education programs have five-year curricula. Some of these have been successful. The question remains: Will vocational teachers subscribe to a five-year pre-service teacher education program? Further, will such individuals be attractive to school administrators? A study of administrators and teachers in Montana found that two-thirds preferred a four-year program (Welch 1984).

The nature of the vocational education program is a definite consideration in teacher preparation. Unique qualities in vocational education need to be retained, as appropriate. In other words, the work of professional agriculture teachers is different from that of home economics teachers. Some teacher educators fear the erosion of the ability of teacher education programs to prepare teachers who can deal with the unique programming considerations.

What about the loss of teachers who can inspire youth to improve their situations in life? This is particularly important when we recognize the disadvantaged backgrounds of a high proportion of vocational students. Teacher education models built around serving only the needs of academic achievers may ignore the needs of many vocational students. Many vocational teachers have been prepared to interact with students in their homes and work situations. Teacher education models that fail to recognize educational activities beyond the school building will certainly reduce the capacity to meet the needs of many vocational students. Models that fail

to recognize non-formal educational methods will have long-range negative impacts on vocational education.

Coping With The Models

Vocational teacher educators are professionally accountable in the matter of preparing the best possible teachers. In some universities, this will require the ability to cope with the implementation of the models. Teacher educators will need to develop new ways of thinking about the preparation of vocational teachers. A spirit of moving forward--not one of being reactionary--will likely result in the most constructive vocational teacher education. We need to embrace changes that produce better teachers. And, in this matter, we can help shape our own destiny!

Coping with the implementation of the models can begin with something called "alienation elimination." Simply, this refers to not objecting to changes to the extent that vocational teacher education is alienated. The support of university administrators is needed if vocational teacher education is to survive and prosper. A spirit of cooperation and diligence to solve problems associated with implementation of the models will strengthen the bond between university administrators and teacher education programs. Further, a cooperative spirit may allow vocational teacher educators to be involved in shaping the model that is implemented. It is far better to participate in the construction of the models in the respective universities than to observe the construction of something that reflects none of our needs.

Developing a plan for the implementation of the models, and/or their components, is essential. No doubt, universities will have written plans to accomplish the change. Vocational teacher education needs to be a part of the overall plan. Further, implementation may be enhanced in the respective vocational teacher education programs if they have written plans of their own. Such plans should be carefully prepared and involve input from representatives of the various constituent audiences.

Keeping the various constituent audiences apprised of what is happening is essential. Prospective vocational teacher education students need full information. State staff personnel and teachers need to be aware of the occurring changes and involved to the fullest extent possible. Vocational teacher education programs administered outside colleges of education have the added burden of keeping their respective administrators informed. This may not be easy, especially with administrators who have preconceived, negative ideas regarding teacher education.

Developing mechanisms for not compromising occupational competence is essential. Liberal arts graduates lack technical competence. It is very conceivable that prospective vocational teachers will be required to take many more hours of credit courses than, for example, elementary teachers. Regardless, we must develop vocational teacher preparation programs that prepare the most "occupationally-competent" teachers. Conversely, we cannot compromise general education.

Since the models require more than four years of college education, consideration needs to be given to procedures for ensuring an adequate number of vocational teachers. Incentives need to be in place. We cannot rely on the salary level of teaching to attract capable individuals, as salaries for teachers are often among the lowest received by college graduates. A mechanism for providing stipends and scholarships needs to be in place. Graduate assistantships might be appropriate in some situations. Another problem is that vocational teacher education programs typically do not have sufficient financial resources to do what will need to be done. A system of pre-professional studies, fellowships, or internships may be attractive. These may need to receive funding from state education agencies, the universities, and, with local school districts that value quality teaching, local school administrative units. Perhaps provisions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act will allow funds to be used in this manner.

Summary

Is education in the United States in as bad a shape as the Holmes and Carnegie reports would have us believe? The complete rebuilding of education, as called for in the Carnegie report, is not entirely necessary in my opinion. Further, I believe there are many others who will agree. The report cites practices and outcomes in Korea and other nations that are undesirable. A good example is that Koreans ". . . work seven days a week (with two days off a year), twelve hours a day. They earn $3,000 a year" (Carnegie Forum 1986). We don't need that kind of education!

All of us would agree that we need to improve education. We would agree that vocational teacher education needs to improve. And that is precisely what I hope we do! However, it is urgent that the models be tested on a pilot basis before widespread implementation is initiated. We need to avoid rushing into massive changes without evidence that the changes will improve what we are now doing.

We will be more successful by using a positive approach to the Holmes and Carnegie models. I believe we can find ways to be a part of improving vocational teacher education in our universities as these models, or fragments thereof, are implemented. We must work to improve vocational teacher education. This will most likely occur if vocational teacher educators approach the models with a positive attitude.

Bibliography

Berkey, A. L., editor. (1981). Teacher Education In Agriculture. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Carnegie Forum. (May 21, 1986). "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century," The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Lee, J. S. (March 14, 1986). "Vocational Agriculture Teacher Preparation." Paper presented at the Conference on Technology, The Economy, and Vocational Education, Little Rock, Arkansas, sponsored by the Southern Growth Policies Board, Research Triangle, North Carolina.

Sikula, J., Task Force Chair. (1986). Visions Of Reform Implications For The Education Profession. Reston, Virginia: Association of Teacher Educators.

Welch, T. M. (1984). "Attitudes of Montana Vocational Educators Toward a Fifth-Year Preparation Program." Staff Study, Montana State University.

_____. (1986). Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report Of The Holmes Group. East Lansing: Michigan State University.